THE ENGLISH CATHOLIC.

The Quarterly Gazette of the Anglican Society.

WARTIME EDITION.

WINTER & SPRING, 1945. [DOUBLE NUMBER, 1s.] Vol. 15. Nos. 60 & 61

President: The Revd. H. ADEANE BYARD, The Vicarage, Newport Pagnell, Bucks.
General Secretary & Hon. Treasurer: The Revd. G. B. TIMMS, 341 London Road, Reading.
Editor: The Revd. A. W. BLANCHETT, Chadlington, Oxford.
Diocesan Organizing Secretaries: See the General Secretary's Notes.
America: The Revd. CHARLES E. HILL, Christ Church Rectory, Ballston Spa, New York.

THE OBJECTS OF THE SOCIETY ARE: 1.—To promote and preserve the Catholic Faith in strict accordance with the principles laid down by the Book of Common Prayer. 2.—To uphold and appreciate the English use, both in rite and ceremonial.

All who are in sympathy with the Objects of the Society are invited to communicate with the General Secretary. Annual subscription for members, 3/6, which includes subscription to the *English Catholic* (2/- per annum, post free).

EDITOR'S NOTE.

An Exhibition of Religious and Secular Art is brought to the notice of our readers. It is to be held in the Church Hall of the John Keble Church, Deans Lane, Mill Hill, from July 14th-21st. The Exhibition will be opened on July 14th at 3 p.m. by the Dean of St. Albans.

WILLIAM LAUD, ARCHBISHOP AND MARTYR.

Jan. 10, 1945, is the three hundredth anniversary of the martyrdom of Archbishop Laud. The significance of Laud does not lie in his association with the cause of personal government in England, which dragged him down with it in its fall; but in the fact that he, more than any other single man, turned the course of the English Reformation. Most of our Reformers, although the Prayer-Book which they drew up provided the basis for the development of the Anglican "Middle Way," did not clearly distinguish between their own movement and that of their contemporaries on the Continent. They appealed, it is true, to the Fathers, but so, at times, did Luther and even Calvin. Bishop Jewel's Apology for the Church of England, which was long regarded almost as an official defence of the English Reformation, does not draw any fundamental distinction between the position of the English and the Continental Reformers. All through the reign of Elizabeth, the English Church was moving steadily in the direction of Geneva, in spite of the Queen's known preference. The English Church at that time appeared to be a compromise between Rome and Geneva, made for the purpose of avoiding civil war, but without any basis of principle. Until recently, and perhaps still in some circles, the English Church has on the Continent been classified as an anomalous form of the "Reformed" religion of Geneva. The turn of the tide seems to have begun with the publication of Hooker's "Ecclesiastical Polity." This was the first Anglican theological treatise, properly so called: on certain subjects, notably the Eucharist, the Priesthood, and the relation of Church and State, it required

correction, but apart from these, it provided the first clear statement of Anglicanism as a system, not as a compromise. Hooker was supported by a whole school of divines : the Devotions of Bishop Andrewes and the poems of George Herbert are the most permanent of their works. But the claim which they made, that the English Church was Catholic but not Papal, rejecting alike the Council of Trent and the "Holy Discipline" of Geneva as inconsistent with the faith and order of the Primitive Church, could hardly have survived the assaults of the Puritans within and the Jesuits without, if it had not found men willing to die for it. These men were William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury, and his pupil and master, King Charles I. Never was it more true that the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church.

Laud's Puritan opponents called him an "Arminian," because he denied their appalling dogma of predestination to eternal damnation. This was their bitterest theological complaint against him. The popular belief that the Puritans stood for freedom, whether theological or political, is a delusion. The men who emigrated to America because they would not submit to Laud's insistence on decency in church, set up there a colony in which Quakers were publicly flogged and a man who kissed his wife on Sunday was fined ! It was an essential part of their system, that all who were not of the "elect," including, of course, all Papists, were from eternity predestined to Hell. Elizabeth's penal laws against Papists were political, directed against those who were commanded to overthrow her government if they could : but the Puritans regarded the practice of Romanism as an offence to God, of which those who were found guilty were to be treated as Joshua was commanded to treat the Canaanites.

And yet, though Laud was constantly being accused of "Popery" (so was even John Wesley !), he had no sympathy with the Counter-Reformation. His famous controversy with Fisher the Jesuit shows this clearly. He taught that the Church cannot wholly err, that is, she is indefectible : but that she is not incapable of making mistakes, that is, she is not infallible. He held that in the interpretation of Scripture we are to be guided by Church tradition and reason ; not by the decrees of Trent, or by "the principles of the Reformation" (which too often means the opinions of Luther or Calvin), or by unlimited private judgment.

Just a century ago, James Bowling Mozley, one of the ablest followers of the Oxford Movement, wrote a brilliant essay on Laud, which we recommend to all our readers (Essays Historical and Theological, vol. i). At the end of it he summed up Laud's work in words as true now as they were then :

"Laud's is an instance of a great career founded upon a dream : a great, practical, powerful, political mind, that pursued a visionary object. The high feudal idea of Church greatness which led him through his course was an impracticable, unreal one, in the great revolution of society which had taken place. When the Church has once lost her hold upon the mass, and fallen from her power, she must be restored from below and not from above. She has to begin from the bottom again, and must be raised by the slow advance and gradual inoculation of the mass. She must rise again by a popular movement, and by influences and efforts upon the open air and level. Laud's movement was not a popular one, and we know not whether it could have been made so. The age was set one way, and he took perhaps the only engine there was for him. But to erect a high medieval prelacy and priestly power upon such a puritanized basis as the Church then presented, was, in strict *ordo naturae*, beginning at the wrong end. We are criticizing the movement, and not the man. The man is dependent upon his age, and must take what weapon comes to hand. It was better doing something than nothing ; using an awkward and inaccurate instrument, than none at all. . . .

Let us not be misunderstood, however. Laud's career was not unpractical because its aim was visionary ; not ineffective because it did not hit its own favourite mark. It had most important practical effects upon the English Church. . . . .

Laud's immediate acts and claims were most practical, and a great practical rise in the English Church was the effect of his career. He stopped her just in time, as she was rapidly going down hill, and he saved all the Catholicism which the reign of Genevan influence had left her. There is no mistaking the tendencies of that period. That we have our Prayer-Book, our altar, even our Episcopacy itself, we may, humanly speaking, thank Laud. The holy table in

all our churches, altar-wise at the east end, is a visible memorial of Laud which none can escape. It was not so before his time; it is not necessarily so by the actual rubric of our Church at this moment. That our Articles have not a Genevan sense tied to them, and are not an intolerable burden to the Church, is due to Laud. He rescued them from the fast tightening Calvinistic grip, and left them, by his prefixed "Declaration," open. Laud saved the English Church. That anyone of Catholic predilections can belong to the English Church, is owing, so far as we can see, to Laud. He saw the good element that was in her, elicited, fostered, and nurtured it; brought the incipient Church school to size and shape, and left it spreading over the Church, and setting the standard. Let us be historically just. Let the dead have their due. Let us acknowledge facts, and allow their true stamp and authorship to remain upon them. The English Church in her Catholic aspect is a memorial of Laud." C. B. Moss.

LAUD IN SCOTLAND.

It may be due to the unreasoning prejudice of ultra-Scots that William Laud, a pure bred Englishman, should have been by Scots Presbyterians generally made to bear the brunt of so many false accusations. These are more properly chargeable against James VI of Scotland and first of England, and his martyred son, Charles I, the one born in Edinburgh of Scottish parents, the other at Dunfermline, of a Scots father. It must be admitted that if Laud was lacking in tact, which can scarcely be denied, the monarchs with whom he was associated were much more tactless, a failing as unfortunate as it proved in every way deplorable. Yet that there was undoubted provocation for convinced and enthusiastic Church men to disregard prejudices which it had been wiser to regard, is undeniable. If James, already revolted from his early experiences of Scots Presbyterianism, and Charles as well as Laud, had been exasperated by Puritan slovenliness and utter irreverence in England, they found the situation even worse in Scotland. There stubborn Presbyterianism found its most stalwart supporters in those nobles whom the so-called "Reformation" had enriched, and who clung to their riches, threatened at least by Charles who desired to restore all plunder to the Church.

Laud first made his appearance in Scotland when he was but Dean of Gloucester, and accompanied James in March 1616 on his visit to Edinburgh. There the Chapel Royal of Holyrood, now a pitiable ruin, was fitted up in seemly fashion for the worship of Almighty God. English carpenters arrived by sea at Leith with statues of the Apostles to set up in the chapel, giving rise at once to the cry of "No Popery!" Although three of the Scots bishops wrote to the King asking him to "stay the offering of these portraits," he replied angrily asking them if they were as ignorant as to confuse pictures intended for ornament with these set up for adoration.

Laud had become Archbishop when he returned to Scotland in June 1633 for the Coronation of King Charles in Holyrood. Previous to this solemnity, he notes that he "was sworn Counsellor of Scotland," and of the Coronation itself on "Tues. after Trinity Sunday," he writes, "I never saw more expressions of joy, than were after it." The ceremony was performed by Archbishop Spottiswoode of St. Andrews and the sermon was preached by Lindsay, Bishop of Brechin. But Laud is accused by Rushworth of having acted in an overbearing way to the Archbishop of Glasgow, in thrusting him aside during the solemnity for not wearing his "whites," i.e. his canonical dress. On June 30 the Archbishop records that he "preached to His Majesty in the chapel of Holyrood House," and of this, Clarendon remarks that it was that "which scarce any Englishman had done before in the King's presence," and that it was "principally upon the benefit of conformity and the reverend ceremonies of the Church with all the marks of approbation and applause imaginable." It was on the occasion of this visit that Laud notes regarding "His Majesty's Chapel Royal," that "then also was the English service read twice a day in that chapel. And a strict command was given them by His Majesty that it should be so continued; and allowance was made for it. *And none of the Scots found any fault with it at that time or after, till the tumults began.*" (M.E.M.D.'s italics).

During the last 9 days of his visit to Scotland, Laud saw the ruins of the beautiful Cathedral of "Dunblain," and it was then that he made his celebrated correction of the "fellow" who attributed its condition to the work of the "Reformation," telling him that "Deformation" was the right word to use.

It is, however, in connection with the introduction of the miscalled "Laud's Liturgy" in the infamous riot of 1637 in St. Giles' Cathedral, (then, and not as now, properly so-called) that the Archbishop is most maligned by Scots Presbyterians. In the "History" of his "Troubles and Trial," Laud tells us himself that "When I was first Bishop of London, His Majesty expressed a great desire which he had to settle a Liturgy in the Church of Scotland, and this continued in agitation for many years." The Archbishop makes it abundantly clear that had he had his way, the English Prayer Book would have been introduced into Scotland. Had this been done, it would not have been for the first time, for Knox, himself a priest who had ministered in the English Church, had brought the English Prayer book for use in Scotland. It was indeed two of the Scottish Bishops, Maxwell and Ross, who prepared a service book to replace the Genevan "Forme" or "Book of Common Order," and Laud himself, explicitly says: "I would have nothing at all to do with the manner of introducing it but left that wholly to them." The two Scots Bishops, however, asked for suggestions for its revision both from the English Archbishop and the King, and these they received.

In his comments on the malicious charges of his implacable enemy Prynne, Laud gives much interesting information about the Church in Scotland, as well as erudite condemnation of Presbyterian use and wont. Regarding St. Giles, originally but a Collegiate Church, Laud writes: "At Edinburgh the King's command took down the stone walls (of division) and galleries, which were there removed, and not mine. For His Majesty in a Christian and princely way, erected and endowed a bishopric in Edinburgh*, he resolved to make the great church of St. Giles in that city, a cathedral." The Presbyterians had divided up the building, as they did in many other cases, into two or more "Kirks." Here, the Archbishop states "that which was called the lesser Church, was but the chancel of St. Giles, with galleries round about it; and was for all the world like a square theatre, without any show of a church." Laud was charged with these seemly alterations and the proper furnishing of the Church which were actually done, as he says, at "the King's Command." The infamous riot that followed in the restored building on the introduction of "Laud's Prayer Book," was a pre-arranged brawl, the fictitious account of which is continually repeated by those whose concern is to evidence the popularity of Presbyterianism without any regard for truth. For still there can be seen the "cutty stool" alleged to have been thrown by Jenny Geddes, who was in actual fact a loyal apple-woman who rejoiced at the Restoration by making a bonfire of her booth. The untruth is actually perpetuated on a tablet in St. Giles, which the late Dr. Leighton Pullan characterised as "only a monument of modern credulity." The actual brawler on the occasion was one Barbara Hamilton, wife of John Mein, an elder, and a merchant who was distinguished for selling goods on Christmas and other holy days. Remembering what Laud recorded about the previous acceptance of the use of the English Prayer Book, it is not surprising to hear that the disgraceful riot was perpetrated by prentices disguised as serving women. These were wont to act as deputies for their mistresses, relinquishing after the prayers and Scripture reading the good places they had secured for the all-important preaching that was the climax of their "worship."

In other of his comments on Prynne's false charges, Laud gives evidence both of his acute mind and his wide knowledge of Catholic doctrine. Amongst the "novations" of which he was accused, was that of introducing "a Book of Ordination." He asks: "Had they then in Scotland no set form of ordination? I promise you that's next neighbour to no ordination . . . And therefore if this be a novation among them, it's high time they had it." Then Laud counters the Presbyterian assertion that insisting on "the absoluteness of Baptism" is "an error of Popery," by a direct negative, and the counter-assertion that it is "the true tenet of the Catholic Church of Christ"; and most strongly insisted upon

*The See of St. Andrews was enormous, far too large to be adequately ruled by one bishop. So the King took away from it all that part comprising the Lothians to be made into the new diocese.

by " my mother, the Church of England." The Archbishop quotes several of the Fathers against the pernicious Presbyterian practice of " fasting on the Lord's day," the origin of that perversion of Sunday, Presbyterian " Sabbath keeping," still maintained throughout the remote Highlands, and elsewhere by the " Wee Frees " and Free Presbyterians. He instances the " Aêrians " as those " who fasted on Sunday and feasted on Fridays (so Epiphanius) with a perversity followed by the Presbyterians, and states that " by the decree of the 4th Council of Carthage," " if any man shall advisedly and of set purpose, fast on the Lord's day, he shall not be accounted a Catholic . . . And this was so strictly observed in St. Ambrose's time, that it was not held lawful to fast upon that day, no not in Lent." Which Catholic doctrine would but confirm Presbyterians in their perversity, had Laud but known them intimately.

Over and over again recurs the false charge that Laud imposed the Canons upon the Scottish Church, whereas it was the arbitrary action of King Charles. The Archbishop writes : " I have shewed before that this Book of Canons was not printed by my command. But I have a long time found a sad experience, that whatsoever some men disliked was present by my doing. God forgive them." In the same chapter Laud defends the Canon dealing with Sacramental Confession and Absolution, and applauds it for its unique reference, as far as Anglican formularies are concerned, to the " seal of Confession." Further on, in reference to accusations of " Romish rituals" against " the Book of England," as regards his accusers, he writes " I would have them remember we live in a Church reformed, not in one made new." Respecting the Scottish Liturgy, of the complaints that it " inverts the order of the Communion of the Book of England ", Laud answers that to invert the order of some prayers, " doth neither pervert the prayers, nor corrupt the worship of God . . . Yet if a comparison must be made, I do think the order of the prayers, as now they stand in the Scottish Liturgy, to be the better, and more agreeable to use in the primitive Church." In view of all the objections of the Puritans against the English Prayer Book, Laud pertinently asks : " How now comes this Book of England to be so much in their esteem, that nothing must be done without warrant from it ?" Again, regarding " this Liturgy for Scotland," the Archbishop avers, " I laboured to have the English Liturgy sent them, without any omission or addition at all . . . But some of the Scottish bishops prevailed herein against me."

Charged with having spoken against the sacrosanct Presbyterian idol, the National Covenant, Laud frankly owns to the enormity, saying that he did " utterly dislike " it. " And if I did say it was, ' ungodly, damnable and treasonable,' I said no more than it deserved."

Perhaps the wildest of all accusations against Laud, in view of his celebrated controversy with the Jesuit Fisher, was that which charged him with being more popish than had the Pope himself been in his place. He evidently felt this libel most keenly, for he replies that " This comparing of me with ' the Pope himself,' I could bear with more ease, had I not written more against popish superstition than any presbyter in Scotland hath done." But neither Prynne nor other of his associates were concerned about the truth of these various allegations : Laud being the dog they were concerned to hound to death, any stick was good enough to beat him. Against Laud's tactlessness and irascible temper evidenced in Scotland as in England, must be set his conscious rectitude, absolute fearlessness and great moral courage, not to mention his genuine piety. Those in high places to-day of whom leadership is rightly expected, may well learn from Laud just those virtues he displayed, so lacking in these days when the popular policy of compromising principles and weakly yielding to uninstructed clamour, is so much in favour.

M. E. M. DONALDSON.

WILLIAM LAUD—BISHOP OF S. DAVID'S

On June 29th, 1621, William Laud was given the grant of the Bishopric of St. David's. On June 20th, 1626, he was nominated to the Bishopric of Bath and Wells. Those dates will mark the approximate limits to the present article.

The grant of the Bishopric came after Laud's ten years of long service as Chaplain in Ordinary to James I. The King acknowledged this service gratefully, and admitted

that he had hitherto given Laud nothing but the Deanery of Gloucester, " which he well knew was a shell without a kernel." So St. Davids was evidently intended as a more adequate return for so many years of waiting, and Laud himself must have been much gratified by his elevation. Yet, as he writes in his Diary, " The general expectation in Court was that I should then have been made Dean of Westminster, and not Bishop of St. Davids." But the Deanery was retained by Laud's rival Williams, and Laud had perforce to be content with the remote Welsh see. The first Archbishop of Wales, in his " Landmarks in the History of the Welsh Church," says that St. Davids was at that time regarded as an honourable banishment—though why he should have used the phrase when speaking of the rising William Laud rather escapes one. Perhaps St. Davids was hardly the most appropriate see for an Englishman who was already so much occupied with affairs of State that he had to wait until Parliament rose before he was free to visit his see at all. Be that as it may, on Nov. 18th, 1621, William Laud was consecrated Bishop of St. Davids, the eighty-ninth Bishop in succession to Dewi Sant.

During the five years of his episcopate Laud visited the diocese twice : two short visits which together totalled less than five months. W. L. Bevan in his " History of St. Davids " maintains that for all his eminence Laud can hardly have done justice to the diocese in consequence of his non-residence. Yet Laud's latest biographer, Mr. A. R. Trevor-Roper, in a detailed study which shows surprisingly little sympathy with its subject, allows tht Laud " did well by his Welsh diocese (i.e. as compared with other bishops), by making two journeys thither, in spite of his preoccupation at court." And Laud's own opinion of St. Davids can best be gauged by the energy which he put into his episcopal visits, and by the time and interest which he gave to all that concerned it.

The Diary summarises the first visit in a few short entries :

July 5th. " I first entered into Wales."

July 9th. " I began my first visitation at the College in Brecon, and preached."

July 24th, 25th. " I visited at St. Davids, and preached."

Aug. 6th, 7th. " I visited at Carmarthen and preached. The Chancellor and my Commissioners visited at Emlyn and at Haverfordwest."

The Bishop clearly did not regard his diocese as a sinecure. He was determined to learn the state of his diocese : and as far as possible he would learn it by personal enquiry. Brecon is very nearly a hundred miles from St. Davids, and Emlyn about sixty from Haverfordwest. And during forty days of slow travelling the Bishop carried out three visitations in person, and two visitations by his officers, in widely separated districts in the three counties of Brecon, Carmarthen and Pembroke. On any showing it was not a bad month's work.

What did Laud do when he came to his Cathedral Church ? First he was installed in person. Then he proceeded, with a minimum of delay, to show his reforming hand. The record states that " Whereas the Reverend Father in God William Laud hath taken offence that the muniments of the said church are in such shameful confusion and so much neglected, he hath ordered and decreed as follows—viz. that all and singular instruments and deeds " be transcribed and kept in safe custody by the chapter clerk. Here we have at St. Davids an instance of that zeal for order and codification which marks Laud's life throughout. Among the matters to which he gave much time and care in later years, as Chancellor of the University of Oxford, was " To collect and perfect the broken, crossing and imperfect statutes of the University, which had lain in a confused heap for some hundreds of years." And that this was no isolated or novel endeavour is shown by his thorough reform along similar lines in his first year at St. Davids. Not only was the Bishop resolved to learn the state of his Diocese : he was equally resolved to lay down how things were henceforward to be.

In this connection we are fortunate in having preserved for us Laud's Articles of Enquiry at his First Visitation in St. Davids Diocese. These very searching Articles of 1622 are of the utmost value as an expression of the Bishop's mind. No detail was too trivial for him, nothing escaped him.

The " font of stone," the " convenient and decent " communion table, the pulpit, the " faire communion cup, with a cover of silver," the tables of the Ten Commandments, the register book, the terrier of glebe lands—all these came under review, as might have been expected. So also did the

"decent and reverent" recital of Divine Service, the observance of Sundays, fast-days, Rogation days and holydays, the yearly recitation of the Canons, the wearing of the surplice, the use of the sign of the cross in Baptism and of the ring in marriage. And what stands out in the Enquiry is the frequent repetition of such a phrase as "in such order as is set down in the book of Common Prayer, without alteration or omission." Time and again we find this reference to the mind of the Church as expressed in the Book of Common Prayer. It was the unfailing standard by which Laud measured and tested every practice, every rite and ceremony. "Loyal uniformity in the external service of God, according to the doctrine and discipline of the Church"—for that he laboured without cease.

Again, in view of the charges brought against him at his trial, Laud's enquiries in 1622 about "popish recusants or other sectaries" take on an added interest. "Doth your minister endeavour diligently to reclaim the popish recusants in his parish from their errors?" "Is he over-conversant with, or a favourer of recusants, whereby he is suspected not to be sincere in religion?" "Do any of the said popish or other sectaries labour to seduce and draw others from the religion now established?" "How long have the said recusants abstained from divine service or from the Communion?" Question after question bears on the presence within the Church of England of those who sympathised openly or secretly with Rome: and the Bishop's whole energy was directed towards searching them out and counteracting their influence. In this connection it is worth reminding ourselves that it was while he was Bishop of St. Davids that Laud engaged in the famous discussions with Mr. Fisher the Jesuit. And so much store did Laud set by his treatise that in his Will he begged his executor to take care that his book be translated into Latin and sent abroad, "so that the Christian world may see and judge of my religion."

We may seem to have strayed far from Laud's first visit to St. Davids in 1622. The truth is that his Articles of Enquiry in that year might well have taken us even further afield.

The interval of three years which elapsed before the next visit does not concern us immediately, but we are naturally glad to hear of the Ordinations which the Bishop held from time to time. They were evidently not held at the Ember seasons but as occasion required: and the entries in the Diary mention eight occasions, with a total of nine candidates. The entry for Feb. 9th 1623 is very human—"I ordained Edmund Provant a Scot Priest. He was my first-begotten in the Lord." (We wonder how many Bishops in our day could name their first-begotten in the Lord?) All except one of Laud's candidates were either Bachelors or Masters of Arts.

For the rest Laud was much occupied with affairs of State. There were the abortive negotiations with Spain about Prince Charles' marriage, the death of James and the accession of Charles, the King's marriage with Henrietta Maria of France, and his first Parliament, and its dissolution after less than a fortnight's session at Oxford. That was on August 12th 1625. Three days later Laud started again for Wales.

He was ill at the time, the result of a fall. "I never was weaker, in the judgement of my physician." And it says much for his determination that in that state he set out on a journey of more than two hundred miles. Did he make the journey because of what he was proposing to do at the end of it?

On August 21st Laud reached Brecon, where he stayed two days, "very busy performing some business." On the 24th, the Festival of St. Bartholomew, he came safely to Abergwili. And on Sunday, August 28th, he consecrated the chapel or oratory which he had built at his own charge in his house. The Diary gives the story in detail. "I named it the Chapel of St. John Baptist, in grateful remembrance of St. John Baptist's College in Oxford, of which I had been first Fellow and afterwards President." Had he realised it Laud would have preferred the consecration to be held on the following day, the Festival of the Beheading of St. John Baptist, because on that day in 1611 King James had heard his cause about the disputed Presidentship of St. John's College "and with great justice delivered me out of the hands of my powerful enemies." As it was he was satisfied that the consecration had taken place at least on the Eve of the Festival of the Decollation of St. John.

The planning of that Chapel, and all that went towards its building and furnishing, must have cost Laud much in thought and interest and money. There must have

been many messages to and fro, because Laud never let anything arrange itself. And we can hardly be far wrong in thinking that the main purpose of this second episcopal visit to St. Davids diocese was to consecrate that chapel at Abergwili. It is probably quite true, as Mr. Trevor-Roper holds, that Laud did not intend to spend the rest of his days in an obscure Welsh diocese. But equally certainly Laud could not have thought so very meanly of Abergwili and St. Davids, otherwise he would never have built a Chapel at his own cost and furnished it " with valuable plate, rich furniture and costly utensils and whatsoever else was necessary to or convenient for the service of God."

The consecration of this Chapel at Abergwili, with two others, formed part of the charge made later against Laud that he " outwent Popery itself: for the Papists consecrated Churches only, but I had been so ceremonious that I had consecrated chapels also." If the indictment as a whole had not been so tragic in its results we might have regarded it as merely puerile and vindictive. But at least it gave the Bishop the opportunity of pointing out, with his usual sound common sense, that " the use of chapels and churches in regard to God's service, is the same: and if consecration be fit for the one, it must need be for the other also." Further, there was neither law nor canon in the State or Church of England to prohibit it. Consequently he had named his chapel after St. John Baptist, according to the very ancient and usual practice in the Church: but he had dedicated it " only to God and His service . . . so no offence."

There is record of only one other matter during the remainder of Laud's stay at Abergwili. One applicant came in September 1625 to seek Holy Orders, but he was found upon examination to be unfit, and the Bishop " sent him away with an exhortation, not ordained." There was clearly to be no lowering of the standard to meet a shortage of Ordinands.

In November Laud returned to England, and in the following Summer he was translated to Bath and Wells. He was not sorry to leave St. Davids. Indeed he told Sir John Scudamore that he would have fastened on any indifferent thing to get out of Wales. And he was anxious to go to Bath and Wells, even if he did not actually ask to go there. For some time the King would not show his hand. " As for the Bishopric of Bath," Laud writes to his friend, " it rests in the King's thoughts as private as it did." Eventually Laud was nominated. Then to his great disappointment, a short week later the Bishopric of Winchester fell vacant through the death of Bishop Andrewes, and Laud had to admit that since he had been so lately preferred, he knew not " how in modesty to be a suitor again." That word " again " is eloquent. All he was quite sure of was that the vacancy at Winchester was likely to cause a great remove, and " who shall succeed there, God knows. But that I shall not, I know . . ." So William Laud left St. Davids with few if any regrets in the autmn of 1626.

Laud's few years at St. Davids are naturally overshadowed by his many years in London and Canterbury. Yet he did not despise nor neglect his first see in Wales. Those years between 1621 and 1626 taught him much about our country and her needs. He came to know the poverty of small bishoprics, and sought to associate with them what were known as " commendams "—sinecure incumbencies which the Bishop held with the see, just as Laud himself held the living of Rudbaxton in Pembrokeshire. He sympathised also with the parochial clergy, and sought " to find a way to increase the stipends of poor vicars." As Bishop of St. Davids he protested that the Clergy were being burdened by the subsidies which Convocation had voted to the King, and when Abbott the Archbishop rebuked him for interfering in the matter he defended himself vigorously. He had acted " out of a good mind " and " for the support of many poor vicars in the country." So his error, if such it were, was pardonable.

Ten years later, as Primate, Laud could appreciate and sympathise with what his successor reported to him about the state of many churches in St. Davids. They were " so open and cold (thanks to the neglect of the impropriators) that the people in those mountainous parts must endure a great deal of hardness, as well in the churches as in their way to them." And " in those poor and remote places " there were few ministers able to preach and instruct the people. Clearly it was no stranger to conditions in Wales who submitted these reports to the King. And because he knew the physical difficulties, as well as the dangers which the Church had to face from

those who "preached against the keeping of all holydays," and "with their giddiness have offered to distemper the people"—because he knew all this, Laud made it his aim to appoint to the four Welsh dioceses Welshmen who spoke and ministered in Welsh, and also took steps to ensure that they resided for the most part within their dioceses. For this great service done by William Laud to a Church which had suffered long from English-speaking non-resident Bishops, the Church in Wales gives humble thanks to Almighty God.

D. D. BARTLETT.

"LOOK UNTO THE ROCK WHENCE YE WERE HEWN."

We publish below the second of a series of letters written by prominent members of the Oxford Movement. The force of Father Benson's comments seem all the more significant in view of the saintly character of their writer; and who was certainly not given to over zealous bigotry. Some slight abridgements have been made on account of the length of the letter.

Cowley St. John,
June 18, 1882.

My dear . . .

We must treat Roman services in England as schismatical. Of course Rome is a schismatical Branch of the Church everywhere—not merely existing as ourselves and the Greeks, in a state of involuntary separation from the rest of Christendom, but herself the prime cause of all the divisions, and therefore the chief if not the only party that is guilty of schism . . . Here in England, her very existence is sinful, and all her services are carried on, not as a sacramental continuation of ancient worship, but as a schismatical invasion of a Divinely instituted organization . . .

I can in some degree understand people being carried away by a false idea of unity so as to join in Roman services, although I regard such attendance as a very grievous sin; but really I cannot put myself in the position of a person wishing to keep the Month of Mary!

It implies a relation of mind towards the mediation of our Lord Jesus Christ quite at variance with anything I can realize. I do not herein allude merely to the awful exaggerations of the cultus of the Blessed Virgin Mary, but to the elimination of the Blessed Virgin Mary as possessing a permanent benedictory power by reason of her maternity in some channel of grace anterior to the sacramental system of the Church, which I may call the "neck" theory. It is this which is so preposterous.

The neck is between the members and the head, whereas the special and incommunicable blessing of Mary is a blessing of nature preparatory to the dispensation of grace. The Head comes between us and her. I cannot say that I even like persons reciting the Angelus, because one sees what it has grown to; but that is a very different thing from the month of Mary, or as the phrase goes, "being under the mantle of Mary."

People do not realize the Personal Sovereign care which our Lord Jesus Christ, the God-Man, exercises over His Church or the Personal Presence of the Holy Ghost, by whose ministration he exercises it.

The Pope—Mary—the Reserved Sacrament—are in various ways the substitute for this. Of course great Roman Divines hold the doctrines of the Trinity, and of Christ's mediation dogmatically, but they are involved in an atmosphere of popular devotion which they cannot escape from, and which is at variance with these great truths.

I am sure that, however natural it may be to desire to have the reserved Sacrament, the desire for it does, and must, stand in the way of profiting by the presence of the Comforter. Christ is no nearer to us because of that sacramental Presence. He cannot be nearer, for we are one with Him and he with us, and the Throne of God is nearer to us than any monstrance can make it—and His Presence in the Sacrament is supra-local; and therefore Christ does not come nearer to us by that manifestation in space. He is present as our Food, and as our Oblation—but his Personal action is that of a Priest towards God—and it is by His Holy Spirit that he acts towards us. Any action of the Second Person which was not through the Third would be inconsistent with His glorification, and therefore of no value to us. The two Persons cannot be collateral agents. This would be inconsistent with their relation in the Eternal Trinity.

I am afraid people do not at all realize the coequal consubstantial personal Godhead of the Holy Ghost. If they did they would not wish to bring Christ down from above. It is very much like the Israelites thinking that they could take the ark of God into the battlefield. They removed it from the place where it would have been their strength if they were faithful to it.

R. M. BENSON.

LET THE PEOPLE SING.

Many years ago the Church of England made a very real attempt to restore to the people their rightful part in the Church's worship, a part which was characteristic of the early days of the Church.

To this end she translated her services into the "vulgar tongue" so that all might take their part; and she produced the Book of Common Prayer in due course—common, that is, not to the churches of any one particular diocese; but common to all throughout the length and breadth of the land, so that in any town or village the traveller might find the worship of the church there conforming in essentials to the worship offered in his native place.

Those good and wise men who were earnestly trying to restore the corporate worship of the Church had in mind something like what we now call the Parish Communion; but it has taken England nearly 400 years to see the value of what they were striving for!

But they were not content to deal with the words of the service only—the music also came under their review: and so it was that Archbishop Thomas Cranmer and John Merbecke worked together, observing the simple rule of using one note for each syllable of the text.

Both men were steeped in plainsong," the Church's own music and the most perfect vocal expression of worship; and thus they brought into their new work that plaintive character and that humility which had made the ancient plainsong so fitting for the worship of Almighty God.

What is now known as Merbecke's Communion Service was issued "under authority" and therefore it represents the mind of the Church of England as to what ought to be the normal music of the Communion Service in parish churches; and no other music can claim the same authority.

In her wisdom the Church has given us all that we need for the proper conduct of our parishes. The Prayer Book contains many excellent rubrics; but they are not observed as they should be—hence much of our present unrest and lack of unity.

Here in "Merbecke" we have the official music,—and, I would add without hesitation, the most suitable music—for the Parish Communion, which is intended to be used everywhere as the normal vehicle of worship, so that from North to South, and from East to West a man may find the people taking their part in the Church's worship, using both language and music which are "understanded of the people."

It is sometimes objected that the people are not "educated up" to Merbecke. They do not need to be, for it is what may be termed "natural music"; and all the experts, who have had wide experience of its use, agree that the less educated a person is musically the more easily he picks up both the "spirit" and the execution of Merbecke's service.

Opposition usually comes from those who have received a musical education in other spheres. They find it difficult to catch the "spirit" of the melody and they do not understand the simple and *un*metrical technique of its treatment. Yet when once they do grasp it they become "a tower of strength" and never lose their love for this beautiful medium of worship.

The music, upon which Merbecke based his service, was sung at a time when there were no organs, when the human voice provided the music of worship uncumbered by thunderous chords.

That is as it should be to-day. It is quite wrong for the organ to be the dominating factor: it should be an unobtrusive accompaniment to the singing.

Now the beauty of Merbecke's service is that it can be sung by a mere handful or by a large body of people, and it is quite independent of the organ. If the organ should break down the service can go on without a hitch. That is what should happen in the Parish Communion, and therefor the choir should learn to sing the service

unaccompanied, the organ being an added luxury on Sunday.

How should "Merbecke" be sung? Fairly quickly in natural speech rhythm, and each note (except for the final of any phrase, which is naturally sustained) should be of equal length.

Please do not drag along with a heavy organ accompaniment giving a chord for every syllable—that is deadly.

There are many editions of "Merbecke" —and some of them are of little value. Either they are out of date or else they were edited by people who did not really understand the type of music which they were handling.

Good up-to-date editions are those by J. H. Arnold, Royle Shore, and Francis Burgess —the organist is the only person who will really need a copy. These editions provide an accompaniment which follows the melody, and sot hey are best for beginners; but there is one for more experienced congregations, by Martin Shaw, which allows the organist to weave up and down and all over the place while the people sing steadily on.

So far as the melody is concerned there is some slight variation of text, owing to the inaccurate printing of the 16th century and the Church would do well to fix a standard text; but a good edition for the congregation may be had at 1d. per copy from Mowbray's.

One last word: please do not introduce "Merbecke" unless you can find someone who understands it. One of the reasons why it is not more used is that it is so often "murdered." Find a neighbouring priest or organist who will explain its execution and then go ahead and God bless your efforts to let the people sing their part.

J. B. GOODCHILD.

RELIGION AND CONVERSATION.

It may be asked, what they have to do with each other. But a Christian, when he remembers that Our Lord said (Mt. 12, 37) "By thy words (λόγοι *verba*) thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned," feels that he must have some guiding principles in conversation. If a conversation is to be pleasant and profitable, it must certainly be natural and unconstrained. But one can always avoid saying what might be said, and say things in a particular way. The pleasure of meeting a friend largely arises from the conversation with him that follows. It may be marred by the obtrusion of some melancholy memory or some unpleasant topic, as it can be heightened by the exchange of agreeable recollections or worthy sentiments. Obviously some things must be avoided. *Ill-natured gossip* is a great danger. There is no harm in laughing at a man. Did not Chesterton say that he could not hate a man at whom he could laugh? Did not Charles Lamb say he could not hate anyone whom he knew? But the deliberate blackening of a man's character, and adding some item to the un-avoury total, is to be utterly eschewed. *Exact truthfulness* in quoting or describing another is necessary; a lie told against an enemy may have appalling consequences. *The conscious desire to edify* should certainly be absent from the ordinary conversations of life. Coleridge asked Lamb if he had ever heard him preach. Lamb replied "I never heard you do any thing else." It is unnecessary to say that a Christian cannot allow himself or condone in others, indecent and immoral talk. The 18th century conversation of men after dinner when the ladies had retired, was often unmitigated filth. This is happily no longer the fashion, but much survives; and no Christian can countenance or participate in anything of the kind. So much for the negative side; now for the positive. All good conversation is a sharing, a fellowship, a κοινωνια to which each contributes in his turn. No one ought to lecture or preach. But his contribution is bound to add to knowledge, or to edify, if it is good. It must however have a direct bearing on what the other has said. Some converse as if they were playing a game of cards. They seem desirous not to answer a question or follow up a subject so much as to trump the other's card, to outdo him in wit or in accuracy. It may be fitting to make an appropriate jest, or give a more precise account of something already related; but it should always be done without hurting the feelings of the other. Why does the professed evangelist more often excite dislike than secure conviction? Is it not when he assumes a knowledge of the Bible, and a respect for

the sanctions of religion which the average Englishman to-day does not possess? A Christian's conversation therefore, if directly evangelistic, is likely to fail more often than to succeed in making a convert. But from a man's conversation it ought to be plain that he is living at a high level, and breathing purer air than the common run of men. True goodness, nowhere more clearly exhibited than in ordinary talk, is sure to extort even from the unwilling admiration, and it may even be the desire of imitatiou. Happy he of whom it can be said, I was never in his society for an hour without feeling a better man. So we return to Our Lord's solemn words, "I say unto you that every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment. For by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words shalt thou be condemned."

G. C. RICHARDS.

THE CHURCH CATECHISM IN VERSE.

There are divided opinions about the age for Confirmation. Some think it should be early: some that it should be deferred till fifteen or sixteen, when boys and girls can understand the Church Catechism. Why this should be so formidable is not easy to say, except that the language is rather formal and antiquated, and does not appeal to our modern ways of writing for children. Some people would even re-write the Catechism in 20th century English! Most people would agree that 15 or 16 is much too old. Probably it would be best of all to take each child or young person individually, which is what many wise parents do.

But there is no doubt that it is right to let a child begin at the earliest age possible to learn what is meant by Holy Baptism; and for this purpose *The Church Catechism in Verse*, originally written for the Infant class in a Sunday-school, is the very best. (It can be had from S.P.C.K., price 3d.)

In Ireland, where it was first used, it had been usual, in years past, in the country at any rate, for children of all ranks to attend Sunday-school, and to be taught together. In such a school, the author of The Church Catechism in Verse taught the Infants for many years, and died at the age of 83, having taught her class the Sunday before. The little book is the result of her own experience.

It was used lately with a class of boys "evacuated" to the country during the present war, from a London slum. They took to it readily, and enjoyed repeating the couplets with a very short explanation of each, though they would not have listened to an ordinary lesson on the Catechism for more than about ten minutes.

The Church Catechism in Verse keeps very closely to the Prayer-Book one, but the words are shorter, and being in couplets, are easy to remember. It begins:

"Who are you?"
"A little Christian Child am I
Whose Heavenly Father dwells on high."

"How came you to earth?"
"God gave mé to my parents dear,
That I may learn to know Him here."

"Did not your parents give you to God?"
"In Holy Baptism they gave
My infant soul to Christ to save."

"What was then given to you?"
"My Christian name by which I stand
Enrolled in Christ's own soldier band."

"What were you then made?"
"Member of Christ, the child of God,
And heir of Heaven's bright abode."

"What did your godparents do for you?"
"Three things they promised in my name,
And I am bound to do the same:
1. The World, the Flesh, the Devil's power
I must resist from hour to hour:
2. The Christian Faith I must receive
And all its articles believe:
3. God's holy laws I must obey
And try to do His Will each day."

The "I desire," always a bugbear, becomes quite easy.

"What do we ask in the Lord's Prayer?"
Answer:—
"*Our Father*, up in heaven's own light
Help us to worship Thee aright.
'*Thy Kingdom come*,' O may we be
True, loyal subjects unto Thee.
'*Thy Will be done*,' that Will is best,
And all who love it shall be blest.
'*Give us this day our daily bread*,'
And may our souls by Thee be fed.
'*Forgive our sins*' and make us know
The grace to pardon every foe,

'O guard us in 'temptation's day':
And '*lead us*' lest we go astray.
From sin and Satan set us free,
That we may live our lives in Thee."

From Part II.: "How many Sacraments hath Christ ordained?"
"Two Sacraments hath Jesus given
To bring to us His grace from heaven."
"What meanest thou by this word Sacrament?"
"An outward sign which I can see
Conveys the grace of God to me."

So many misunderstandings have arisen from inaccurate quotation, and caused scoffers to speak against the Prayer-Book, that it is most important that the words should be learned accurately. Among these is the well known saying that the Church of England teaches that people must remain in the state in which they were born, from "do my duty in that state of life to which God has called me"; whereas the words really are "in that state of life to which God *shall* call me."

Part II (by C. B. Moss) was added some year; later, by Miss Rothwell's wish, and it is to be noted that it does not say of the Sacraments "two only" but two only, as "necessary to salvation, ordained by Christ Himself," etc.

The Church Catechism in Verse, also contains three hymns, which can be taught at the same age, and in the same way, bit by bit. These are "Once in Royal David's City," the Incarnation. "There is a green Hill," the Atonement. "Do no sinful action," conduct and the motive for it. All by Mrs. Alexander, wife of a former Bishop of Derry, afterwards the Archbishop of Armagh.

A suggestion for parish clergy has been made, that *The Church Catechism in Verse* should be offered to parents and godparents at baptisms:—not *given*, as what is bought is often more valued. It might be sent to Australia and Canada for the caravan missions, and to various missionary societies; also to bookstalls for G.F.S. If used to teach older children, the word "Boy" or "Girl" could be used for the "child."

F. E. M. Moss.

Appleton Manor, Nr. Abingdon.

BOOKS REVIEWED.

"The Church and the Papacy, a Historical Study," by T. G. Jalland, D.D. [S.P.C.K., 25/-.]

The Bampton Lectures of 1942, in spite of their immense and minute learning (which, however, does not save the author from making several serious blunders), are an attempt to do what cannot be done: to show that the new light thrown by modern scholarship on the history of the Papacy requires us to look at the Papal claims in a new way. But the new light is not forthcoming: the facts are well-known, and modern scholarship has made no important change in them. Nobody can write about the Papacy without prejudice: we are all committed either to accepting it or rejecting it. We must regret that so much time and so much learning have been bestowed on ploughing a field which cannot produce any fresh crops.

In any defence of the papal claims, we turn at once to see what is said about their weakest point, the connexion between St. Peter and the Roman see. Dr. Jalland rejects the only possible evidence for it in the New Testament: I. Pet. v. 13, because he thinks that the epistle was probably not written by St. Peter, and Rev. ix. 8, because the Two Witnesses are more likely to be Moses and Elijah than St. Peter and St. Paul. He accepts the admittedly post-apostolic tradition that St. Peter was martyred at Rome (so did that redoubtable adversary of the Papacy, Dr. Salmon). But the necessary basis of the papal claims is the belief that St. Peter was not merely martyred at Rome, but Bishop of Rome. Dr. Jalland can produce no evidence for this: he admits that "the Petrine pontificate is unhistorical" (p. 74). In the absence of evidence for St. Peter's Roman episcopate, all that may be said about him is irrelevant to the papal claims; for the Popes are not his successors. Nevertheless, Dr. Jalland constantly refers to Rome as the See of St. Peter. We cannot protest too strongly against the use of this phrase, however ancient and widespread, because it gives to the papal claims just that glamour, that appeal to the imagination, on which, having no basis in history or reason, their supporters rely.

Nevertheless, Dr. Jalland is no Ultra-

montane: in his later chapters he becomes less and less favourable to the Papacy, as its claims become more and more comprehensive. What he seems to want is a Papacy but not the existing Papacy; in a word Gallicanism in some form. But history has shown that Gallicanism is impossible. The Papacy cannot be a constitutional or limited monarchy: it has, rightly from its own standpoint, rejected Gallicanism, which can never satisfy either those who accept the modern Papacy or those for whom the papal claims, based on the Petrine texts, are incredible. If we are to have a papacy of any kind in the united Church of which we dream, it must be the actual Papacy, not an imaginary one. And since that is impossible, attempts to make the papal claims more tolerable are hindering, rather than helping, the reunion of Christendom; for the total abolition of the papal claims is a necessary condition of reunion.

Therefore Dr. Jalland's thesis leads us nowhere. Moreover, so far from producing new evidence, he sometimes ignores or misinterprets what is already well-known. For instance, on p. 64, he says, "It is Simon the Rock alone whose attitude appears to possess a certain finality, and from whose decision there would seem to be no appeal." But this is not the picture presented by the New Testament. St. Peter is the leader and the spokesman, but not the court of appeal: for instance, in Acts xi. 2, unmentioned by Dr. Jalland, he is obliged to defend himself: he is not, like the Popes, "judge of all and judged by none." On p. 98 Dr. Jalland quotes "a modern Protestant writer" as if his admission that the "rock" was St. Peter settled the question: why? On p. 114 he completely ignores Puller's excursus on the meaning of "convenire ad" in the Vulgate; if he disagreed with Puller, he should have answered him. He accepts the opinion of a recent Jesuit that the passages in St. Cyprian's "De Unitate," commonly held to be interpolated, are genuine: ignoring the fact that they are inconsistent with St. Cyprian's well-known belief that all bishops are equal.

Other mistakes are his notion that the "fermentum" was used to communicate whole congregations (p. 154), whereas it was a mere fragment, sent as a symbol of unity, and could not have been used for such a purpose: and his assertion that the "Jansenist" (Dutch Old Catholic) bishops were invited to the Vatican Council (p. 509), which is denied by Dom Cuthbert Butler. (Vatican Council, vol. i. p 95.)

Dr. Jalland sees in the history of the Papacy "a supernatural grandeur which no mere secular institution has ever attained in equal measure," and "a burning zeal for order and *Justitia*" (p. 543). He thinks that those who cannot see it are blind. If so, there are a great many blind people! As no Romanist could assent to some of Dr. Jalland's opinions about the Papacy, it seems more likely that his vision, peculiar in more than one sense, is the result of rose-coloured spectacles! For very few non-Romanists see anything more "supernatural" in the Papacy than in any other bishopric, nor is its zeal for justice (to Ethiopia, or to the non-Papalist party to a mixed marriage?) obvious to most of us!

The moral of this book is that Anglican bishops and theologians should beware of speaking of the Papacy in terms which may easily be supposed to mean more than they do mean. Three Lambeth Conferences have declared that "there can be no fufilment of the Divine purpose in any scheme of reunion which does not ultimately include the great Latin Church of the West." (they did not say "the see of Rome"). This sentence as it stands is a truism: Christendom cannot be united, if half of it remains outside the union. But though it would be a profound mistake to suppose that the Lambeth Conference was weakening in its opposition to the papal claims, Romanizers in the English Church have constantly put forward this sentence in support of their propaganda. Dr. Jalland has failed to show that our traditional resistance to those claims is not entirely justified, or that the evidence marshalled against them by Denny and Puller, Salmon and Gore, the Dean of York and Canon W. L. Knox, not to mention Andrewes and Laud, is not as convincing as ever. John Bampton desired that his Lectures should "confirm and establish the Christian Faith, and confute all heretics and schismatics." But the acceptance of the Christian Faith would be tenfold more difficult, if it included the unhistorical claims of the Papacy.

C. B. Moss.

"English Prayer Books," by Stanley Morison. [Cambridge Univ. Press, 10/6.]

This book is the first of a series to be published which will deal with the problems

of worship as they affect us to-day. The Dean of St. Paul's and the Dean of Liverpool are the Editors. We understand, however, that the writer of the present book is a Roman Catholic. This fact ought to have been mentioned in the preface by the General Editors because without this knowledge the reader will not be able to reconcile the position of the Editors with some of the statements that occur in the text.

"English Prayer Books" gives us a fair survey of the production of liturgical books from primitive times up to the present day. The larger part of Mr. Morison's writing is very naturally taken up with the production and use of liturgical books in England; both before and after the Reformation.

In treating of the post-Reformation period not only Anglican books are surveyed but also the texts of the Roman liturgy which have been produced for use in England. The recent "Free Church" compilations of a liturgical character are also reviewed.

In recent years the needs of the times have resulted in many "Ad hoc" services, the most outstanding being those used at Liverpool Cathedral. Mr. Morison gives us a fair specimen of the work of Dean Dwelly in this direction. Some readers will of course revel in this kind of thing; but not a few we suspect will experience a chill down the back on reading this example of the genius of the Liverpool Rite!

To our mind the most useful part of this book is that which deals in the modern period with the attempts made in the last century and in this one, to produce books which shall be worthy of the sacred text which they convey.

"A Server's Manual," Alcuin Club, [Mowbray, 1/9.]

This manual was favourably reviewed in a previous number of the *English Catholic* and since then a member of the Anglican Society submitted a copy to the Bishop of London (Dr. Fisher) from whom the following statement was received—"It is a very useful guide and fits in entirely with my regulations for the order of the Liturgy. Those who want guidance about ceremonial would be well advised to take this manual as their guide."

CORRESPONDENCE.

1927 and 1928.

Sir,—The *Church Times*, which has always been strongly opposed to the use of the 1928 Prayer Book, recently told a correspondent that "the 1927 book has spiritual authority, but the bishops will not allow it to be used." This was a very strange assertion. The 1928 book was given spiritual (though not legal) authority in 1929, and the bishops were expressly precluded from forbidding any part of it, as was shown in a recent article in the "English Catholic". One would suppose that the resolution of 1929 suspended that of 1927. But it has been the policy of the opponents of the book to hush up the resolution of 1929, and they have evidently succeeded in "pulling the wool over the eyes" of the *Church Times*!

But what makes the assertion stranger still is that there is no difference at all between the 1927 and 1928 books, except the addition in the latter of the rubrics about Fasting Communion and Reservation, and the rubric which requires the 1662 liturgy to be used at least once a month if there is a desire for it. The rites in the two books are identical. Whoever uses any of the variations permitted in 1928, is using the book of 1927. If, as the *Church Times* admits, the 1927 book has spiritual authority, the rites of the 1928 book have spiritual authority. Those who hesitate to use the rites of the 1928 book because they still think that they lack spiritual authority (if they hold this theory they must rigidly obey the 1662 Prayer-Book), may be glad to have the support of the *Church Times* for greater freedom.

C. B. Moss.

Revised Marriage Service.

Sir,—Mr. Benson's solicitor was mistaken. The O.E.D. gives as one of the meanings of "share," to receive or possess in common with others (1592). If a waitress in a tea-shop says "Do you mind sharing a table?" she does not suggest cutting the table in two! The bridegroom possesses all he has in common with his bride: he does not make her a present of it, which is the meaning of "endow."

Mr. Goodchild may claim that there is a liturgical reason for "Dominus vobiscum" before the Gospel: but not that there is any authority for it in our present rite. To say it, without authority, is sheer anarchical "private judgment": a small matter, but if we are anarchical in small things, we soon shall be in great ones.

C. B. Moss.

"Forgotten Ceremonies of the Prayer-Book."

Sir,—I am grateful to Dr. Eeles for his letter. It is an interesting letter, because it is a good example of the everlasting differences of opinion that spring up among Anglicans about the legitimacy of almost any ceremony that is mooted. Such debates usually go unsettled, because the disputants are seldom acute enough to perceive that they are pleading in different courts and before different authorities. The crux of the matter is the discrepancy between the Reformers' theories and their practice. What may be conveniently described as "the spirit of the Reformation" did not, in fact, succeed in achieving complete expression in the letter of the Prayer-book,

which remains more Catholic than the movement that was responsible for it. *Hinc illae lachrymae.* This duality sets up two different courts of appeal: the one always ready to give a favourable verdict to those who see a Protestant intention behind rubrical *silentia*, the other inclining consistently towards a Catholic interpretation. In other words, if you happen to dislike a pre-Reformation ceremony you can always dispose of it with the simple (and probably quite accurate) statement that it is incongruous with the mind of the Reformers; whereas your opponent who likes it can take up an impregnable legal position on the same Reformers' failure to prohibit it in their official directory of the Church's worship.

Dr. Eeles' letter is, I think, a good instance of this confusion of appeals. As a matter of fact, I agree frankly with him that the Reformers themselves disliked these Eucharistic ceremonies, having *at that epoch* good reasons for suspecting them. On the other hand, I hope he will agree with me that they did, as a fact, fail to make this note of disapproval sound explicitly anywhere in their Prayer-book. Consequently so long as he keeps away from the Book he is on safe ground: but as soon as he brings the Book itself into court, his inability to make it speak in his favour is apparent. For instance, when a rubric merely says that the Anthems are to be sung in place of the Venite, it is no good insisting that this is also an order to discontinue whatever traditional customs may have been associated with them, because it simply is not. A contemporary priest, confronted with the new rubric, would have readily understood that, whereas the Anthems had formerly been outside the Office, they were now to be incorporated within its framework and the Venite cut out to make room for them; but he would have seen no earthly cause for going beyond the rubric and divesting them at the same time of their habitual ceremonial accompaniment.

Again, when Dr. Eeles is driven to plead that "in the 1549 Prayer-book there is no sign of intending to include any part of the sepulchre ceremonies," he is making a holocaust of carrying lights, burning incense, treating the Litany as a procession, the Greater Entrance, the lavabo and the many other ceremonies out of which, notwithstanding that no English Prayer-book gives any "sign of intending to include" them, *The Parson's Handbook* and the Alcuin Directories have built up what they claim to be the correct Use of the Reformed Church of England. Nor does it help matters to say that the sepulchre ceremonies are "only mediaeval:" for then so are the Palm Sunday procession and the Candlemas ceremonies and the Imposition of Ashes, and yet the Alcuin Committee, of which Dr. Eeles is not the least distinguished member, gives minute instructions for reviving them all. This is another case in which the debater cannot have it both ways. Either he must take the actual Prayer-book itself (with, e.g., its quintessentially mediaeval theory of Consecration) as sufficient warrant for tolerating the mediaevalism of these and other ceremonies: or else he must insist on respect for the abstract "spirit of the Reformation," and so consistently reject everything that is not demonstrably primitive. "Under which king, Bezonian?"

JOHN H. M. STANIFORTH.

Flimwell Vicarage, Hawkhurst, Kent.

Printed and published by
A. T. BROOME & SON, The Cherwell Press, 18 St. Clement's Street, Oxford.